

ample, of the Otts lecture-fund. No representative of the General Education Board has any right, present or future, to inspect the accounts of the College, investigate its records, or examine its methods of investment or expenditure. Far less has it anything to do with the spirit, policies, or management of the College.

Davidson has never in her history taught a course in Theology, yet every cent of the whole fund contributed outside of the \$75,000 given by the General Education Board, could be spent in establishing Theological Chairs, if the Trustees desired so to invest it.

I hope the above full description will clear up a natural and widespread confusion of ideas, disassociate the Davidson-campaign for endowment from the Central University matter, and remove the suspicion that the General Education Board by its gift establishes or claims any future rights of inspection or supervision.

Henry Louis Smith.

Davidson College, N. C., June 26, 1909.

BAPTIST HISTORY AS EXHIBITED IN THEIR RECENT WRITINGS.

By Rev. S. M. Tenney.

In considering the teachings of other churches too often our sources of information are second or even third hand, and as a result too often the facts are misrepresented. Years ago as a youth I observed that our own church suffered greatly in this respect, many laymen and ministers criticising our teachings, even purporting to quote them who had never read, many of whom had never seen, our "Confession of Faith," or a history of our church. Then I resolved not to be guilty of such a slander to my Christian brethren of other denominations intentionally, but to consider it my duty to secure and read their respective histories as written by themselves. As a result of this course I have denied at least some advantages. I have learned to think more kindly of some than otherwise I might have done; I have seen many of their weak points unknown to the ordinary student, and I have been able oftentimes not only to converse intelligently with others about their respective histories and teachings, but have in many cases found them boasting of things their own writings do not substantiate. Again, I have noticed that the historians of late years are not so much influenced by sentiment, as formerly, that they are hewing closer to the line of facts even at the cost of prestige as set forth by their predecessors.

With these introductory remarks I desire to preface a review of the history of the Baptist churches as set forth in a number of recent publications. There are now before me the articles "Anabaptists" and "Baptists" written for the Johnson's Universal Encyclopedia, edition of 1894, by Rev. N. H. Whittitt, D.D., LL.D., late of "The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary," Louisville, Ky.; the

article "Baptists" written for "The New Schaff-Herzog, edition 1908, by Rev. A. H. Newman, D.D., LL.D., Prof. of Church History in "The Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary of Waco, Texas; the article, "Anabaptism" written for "The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics," edited by Rev. Jas. Hastings of London, and appearing in 1908, this article by Rev. W. T. McGlothlin, Ph. D., D.D., the brilliant Prof. who succeeded Dr. Whittitt in "The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary of Louisville"; and "The History of the Baptists in the U. S." written by Rev. A. H. Newman, recently of Toronto University, now of Waco, Texas. All of these writers are men of foremost standing as church historians, recognized as such not only by the Baptist church, but also by others. They have each crossed the sea in search of historical data in behalf of the special subjects on which they have written, so that what they record may be faithfully received as of the latest and best authority. And, further, in reviewing these writings, I desire not to be understood as reviewing them each in full, but only with reference to certain phases of the subject concerned, and this, lest I be accused of misrepresenting, I desire to express as nearly as possible in the language of the several authors.

First, a word with reference to the commonly accepted idea of the church. It is quite generally known that the Baptists as we know them (the "Regular Baptists," who constitute all but a very small percentage of the Baptists in this country) recognize no other church on earth. They are the church. The late Dr. John Broadus writes, "Why ought Baptists not to take the Lord's Supper with believers of other denominations? Because we think they have not been baptized" "or are not walking orderly as to church connection." (A Cate. of Bib. Teachings, p. 34). Again, "What is a Church of Christ? A Church of Christ is a company of baptized believers joined together by covenant to keep the faith and to observe the ordinances of Christ, and to use the means He has appointed for the good of their own souls, for the salvation of others, and for the glory of His Name." "What is baptism? Baptism is a voluntary profession of faith in Christ by an immersion in water, in the name of the Father, and the Son, and in the Holy Spirit." (The Baptist Cate. pp. 27, 25). From these quotations it should be very clear that to the Baptists, the Baptist church is the church, and there is none other, that the idea of the church is "a company of baptized believers," and that by baptized they mean "an immersion in water."

But over against this read: Dr. A. H. Newman says, "Some Baptist writers have sought to find in the Montanists, Novatians, Donatists, Jovinianists, Vigilantians, Paulicians, Bogomiles, etc., who successively revolted from the dominant type of Christianity, and in the ancient British churches that long refused obedience to the Pope, adherents to apostol-

ic doctrine and practice and links in the chain of Baptist apostolic succession. It may suffice here to say that while some of these parties were more and some less evangelical than the church they antagonized, no one of them can be proved to have held to Baptist views as to the nature and subjects of baptism. Was there, then a failure of the assurance of Christ that the gates of Hades should not prevail against His Church? Far be it! We are not able to prove, it is true that from the close of the apostolic age to the twelfth century, a single congregation existed that was in every particular true to the apostolic name: but that there were hosts of true believers even during the darkest and most corrupt periods of Christian history does not admit of a doubt. That a church may make grave departures in doctrine and practice from the apostolic standard without ceasing to be a Church of Christ must be admitted, or else it must be maintained that during long periods no church is known to have existed." (Amer. Ch. Hist. Ser. Vol. II, pp. 12, 13). Here Dr. Newman distinctly declares "that a church may make grave departures in doctrine and practice" "without ceasing to be a Church of Christ," and that as a matter of fact for long, long years it did not hold "to Baptist views as to the nature and subjects of baptism," and yet was a church. This is a concession of the greatest importance, and makes the position of our Baptist friends most inconsistent in recognizing the church of the dark ages which was most erratic, and not in agreement with her tenets, and yet she refuses to recognize any other religious organization of today as a church though some be never so near the truth. How great is the gap our Baptist historians are forced to bridge over will become more evident as we study the history of the Baptists.

Troupe, Tex.

(To be Continued.)

COSTLY THOUGHTLESSNESS.

Here are two vacation experiences of pastors. One of them was summoned back by telegram to officiate at a wedding in his parish. It took considerable time from his days of rest and \$20 for traveling expenses. He received a wedding fee of \$5. Another pastor was called home to attend a funeral. The journey both ways cost him \$40. He received the hearty thanks of the bereaved family for his kindness and nothing more, though they were well able to pay his expenses. We take these instances from an exchange. There is less probability of their identification than if we should cite examples in our own denomination which have come under our observation. We have known of pastors whose brief vacations were thus cut short and whose very limited appropriations for their days of recuperation were seriously reduced. Usually it is not meanness but thoughtlessness which lets such loads fall on ministers.—The Congregationalist.